SOME

REMARKS

ON A

PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED,

A THIRD CHECK

TO

ANTINOMIANISM.

By the AUTHOR of PIETAS OXONIENSIS.

LONDON,
Printed for EDWARD and CHARLES DILLY, in the Poultry.
MDCCLXXII.

[Price Three Pence.]

SOME

REMARKS

ON THE

Third Check to Antinomianiſm.

I HAVE told you, Dear Sir, that I had no thoughts of continuing our Controverſy, either in my own name, or in that of the Author of *Pietas Oxonienſis*. However, upon peruſing your late performance, I find it neceſſary to offer a few Remarks upon it; though theſe will be very ſhort (and without order or connection, juſt as they occurred to me after having read your *Third Check*), as you have taken no notice of the ſecond edition of my Five Letters, in which ſome of thoſe very objections are anſwered, which you make the ſubject of your addreſs.

[I.]

I thank you for the aſſurance you are pleaſed to give me of your regard and friendſhip. Permit me to ſay that I ſincerely value them, and wiſh for an increaſe of them, ſo far as this may be done without giving up what I am perſuaded is the real truth of God. But whilſt I expreſs my thankfulneſs to you on this account, I muſt add that what you are pleaſed to ſay concerning my own perſonal character really humbles me exceedingly: As my own heart bears me witneſs, that I am quite undeſerving the teſtimony you are pleaſed to bear of me before the world.

[II.]

Several pages at the beginning of your book are occupied in confuting the doctrine of particular election. However, I believe your arguments all center in this one point, *Why doth he yet find fault, for who hath reſiſted his will?* And therefore I think there is no need to give them any other anſwer than that of the Apoſtle, Rom. ix. 19, 20. *Nay but, O man, who art thou that replieſt againſt God?* &c. But pleaſe to obſerve, Sir, that you do us great injuſtice in ſuppoſing that we believe or aſſert, that any ſouls ſhall *ſtrive, reform, and pray, without any poſſibility of eſcaping Hell.* On the contrary, we believe that the end and the means are inſeparably connected, and that *ſtriving*, *praying*, and *reforming* are good proofs that a man belongs to *the election of grace.* And now let me aſk you, Sir, as in the preſence of God, if, when you made the above aſſertion, you did not know in your own conſcience that you charged us wrongfully? If not, let me deſire you to point out one Calviniſt divine, either living or dead, who ever advanced any ſuch doctrine, or who did not aſſert, that all

all they who are predeſtinated to eternal life, are *predeſtinated to be conformed to the image of God's dear ſon*, in the way to that life.

But your averſion to what you call Calviniſm ſeems to have hurried you into all the depths of Myſticiſm; by which means, however you may think you harmonize with the ſcriptures, you have ſet yourſelf at abſolute variance with Mr. Weſley, who you know has told us, "*That in his moſt cool judgment, and in* "*the preſence of the moſt high God, he looks upon the* "*Myſtic writers to be one great Anti-Chriſt,*" (*Review*, &c. p. 141); conſequently, in Mr. Weſley's opinion, Mr. F——r himſelf muſt be a limb of that immenſe body.

[III.]

I confeſs I know not what you mean by *degrees of juſtification*, *degrees of redemption*, and a middle ſtate between *enmity* and *reconciliation*; the very mention of which draws with it the idea of being half juſtified, or three parts juſtified; half redeemed, or three parts redeemed. Whereas, the ſcriptures always ſpeak of pardon, juſtification, and redemption, as full, perfect, and complete; and however fearful we may be of *undervaluing ourſelves*, we cannot ſpeak of them any otherwiſe, without greatly undervaluing *the Lord that bought us*.

[IV.]

What really ſurprizes me beyond all the reſt is, your having brought out two new Juſtifications ſince the publication of your *Second Check*; though you give us to underſtand in a note (p. 48), that you knew there were four Juſtifications when you wrote that *check*. But you inſinuate that you thought your readers prejudices would be ſo ſtrong that they could

not bear to hear of theſe four juſtifications all at once, and therefore they were dealt out two at a time. But if, as you alſo inform us, all are *Antinomians, and ſet aſide the beſt half of the ſcriptures*, who deny that ſomething is to be done previous to three of theſe Juſtifications, no apologies can excuſe you for having concealed a matter of ſuch importance till your *Third Check* ſaw the light; ſince, by ſo doing, thouſands, even of your own admirers, have been Antinomians without ſuſpecting it; for, being ignorant that there *were* four Juſtifications, they could not ſet about doing what was neceſſary to be done in order to obtain the three laſt. Beſides, who knows but in your *Fourth Check*, we may be told of two or three more Juſtifications; and ſhould this be the caſe, I doubt not but Mr. Weſley will be as ready to adopt them, as he has ſhewn himſelf ready to adopt firſt your two, and now your four Juſtifications, after his own declaration, that *the Juſtification ſpoken of by St. Paul, and in our articles, was ONE and no more* [A]. I cannot conclude this head without telling you what an excellent miniſter, who had been reading your *Checks*, ſaid upon the occaſion: "Well, well, ſays "he, one Juſtification has been ſufficient for all "God's people that have gone to Glory till this time, "and therefore I think we need not look out for "any more." And give me leave to ſecond his ſentiment, by ſaying, that whilſt I can obtain all that is meant by that one expreſſion, *being juſtified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt*, I am not anxious if I never know any thing of your other three Juſtifications.

[A] Review of Mr. Weſley's Doctrines, Poſtſcript to the Firſt Letter.

V. The

[V.]

The reaſoning you draw from the conduct of a magiſtrate, in committing ſome to priſon and diſmiſſing others with a reprimand, is very inconcluſive to eſtabliſh the notion of ſome ſins not bringing the ſoul under the curſe and condemnation.

The law of God knows but one puniſhment for all ſin; and that is death eternal; for *curſed is every one who continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them.* The law of the land has affixed various puniſhments to various crimes, and by that law every magiſtrate is obliged to regulate his conduct.

[VI.]

Becauſe I aſſerted, *that the gifts and callings of God are without repentance*, you beg me to anſwer ſeveral queries, p. 74, and among others (which really carry with them their own confutation) you aſk, "*Was not innocent Adam intereſted in the divine favor and image; and did he not loſe both, together with Paradiſe, when he fell into ſin?*" I anſwer, this is moſt certainly true; but, bleſſed be God, the ſeed of the Second Adam ſtand on a ſurer baſis, and are intereſted in a better covenant. *Heb.* viii. *throughout.*

[VII.]

Biſhop Beveridge, you ſay, was a young convert when he wrote his Private Thoughts, and when he ſo heartily diſclaimed the doctrine of merit as to ſay, "He could not pray, but he ſinned; he could not "hear or preach a ſermon, but he ſinned; that his "repentance needed to be repented of, and his tears "to be waſhed in the blood of the Redeemer."

True. But Mr. Weſley was twice his age, and had been many years in orders, when he put theſe words into his *Chriſtian Library*; and therefore his firſt adopting them, and then diſclaiming them, will only give us an additional proof of that gentleman's inconſiſtency, and perhaps make a ſtriking figure in ſome future Farrago of his contradictions.—But, Reader, think with concern how deeply error muſt have darkened the mind, when this humble language of that eminent man of God, Bp. Beveridge, is ſet aſide as unfit for thoſe who have attained what Mr. F——r here calls *goſpel liberty*; in other words, *ſinleſs perfection*.

[VIII.]

The whole doctrine of my Fourth Letter, concerning the diſtinction between a believer's perſon and his actions, being backed by a ſtriking quotation from Luther, in the ſecond edition of my Five Letters, and by ſeveral from Mr. Weſley, which I have given in my Review of his Doctrines, I refer you to thoſe quotations. However, I muſt obſerve, that the caſe you have ſtated between David and Claudius, under the ſame acts of ſin, reflects very little honour on David's Saviour and David's Lord. Your words are theſe: "David commits adultery and murder in "Jeruſalem, and Claudius in Rome. God ſees them, "and ſays, agreeably to your ſcheme, They are both "guilty of the ſame crimes, and both impenitent: "But David is a Jew, an elect; a ſheep, and there-"fore, though he ſin againſt ten times more light "than the other, I am not at all diſpleaſed at him. "But Claudius is an Heathen, a reprobate, a goat, "and my anger ſmokes againſt him; he ſhall ſurely "die." It was happy for David, that when he fell ſo groſly, he had a merciful, gracious, and covenant-keeping God to deal with, and that he fell not into the

the hands of *Arminians* and *Perfectioniſts*; but I ſcruple not to affirm, that, admitting the caſe between David and Claudius to be exactly as you ſay, ſtill David remained abſolved from the curſe of the law, whilſt Claudius lay under it. David was a believer, Claudius an unbeliever; therefore that blood which *cleanſeth from all ſin* prevailed for David, but not for Claudius; and that ſame holy law which would have condemned Claudius if he had never committed the ſins you mention, had no power to inflict its curſe upon David, becauſe David was intereſted in him who *hath redeemed us from the curſe of the law, being made a curſe for us.* But *they were both impenitent.* In a ſenſe this ſhall be granted, and in a ſenſe denied. The graces of God's children, whether of faith, patience, repentance, &c. may (for a ſeaſon) not be brought into act, but may lie like a ſpark covered with aſhes: And this was the caſe of David under his ſin; but it was not ſo with Claudius, nor is it ſo with any who are in a ſtate of nature.

To illuſtrate this point ſtill more fully; who ſhall affirm that thoſe graces of humility and meekneſs, which long ſhone ſo eminently in dear Mr. F——r, will never regain their former ſplendor, becauſe, whilſt he was writing his late publications, they have been buried under the rubbiſh of many unhappy tempers, and much corruption? Would I in this caſe put my worthy friend upon the ſame footing with an angry Heathen? God forbid! yet am I hereby thoroughly convinced that the ſeeds of every ſin whatſoever have a place in the hearts of the moſt purified ſaints upon earth, and that there wants nothing but temptation and opportunity to bring them forth. And although God will certainly chaſtiſe his people for ſin, and make them feel what a grievous thing it is to depart from him, yet there is a great difference between his correcting them in love and diſinheriting

diſinheriting them in wrath; nor do any of the examples you have brought prove the contrary, unleſs you will make it appear that Onan was a believer.

Upon your plan, every man is ſaved on account of his being better than others; and from the caſe you have introduced concerning David and Claudius, and from the inſinuations you give of the danger of that doctrine, which, under the ſame circumſtances, declares one to be abſolved, the other condemned, our bleſſed Lord muſt have made *a bold ſtand for Antinomianiſm*, and muſt have acted with the moſt cruel *partiality* towards thoſe good men, the Scribes and Phariſees (who had perhaps only broken the law in the *moſt trifling points*, and by the *innocent infirmities of fleſh and blood)*, when he ſaid to them, *Publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of Heaven before you.*

[IX.]

You ſeem to have widely miſtaken my meaning when I ſaid, *I deny that believing precedes Juſtification*; for where do I aſſert that *Juſtification precedes believing?* No; I believe that true faith and Juſtification are as inſeparable as fire and heat. If I believe, I muſt believe ſome truth; for faith cannot exiſt without ſome object to fix upon; and therefore the very ſuppoſition that any man can have true faith, and yet remain unjuſtified, appears to me a contradiction in terms. However, I do not think we have any need to diſpute on this head, whilſt we both admit, that all who believe *are* juſtified, and that none are *actually* juſtified till they do believe. I am ſorry, however, that you ſhould be ſo haſty in your cenſures as to accuſe me of rejecting the great doctrine of Juſtification by faith alone; which is the more *diſingenuous*, as you have certainly no great reliſh for it yourſelf, and the more *unfortunate*, as you hereby force poor Mr. Weſley (who I underſtand had the reviſal of your book),

book), to tack about a third or fourth time, in order to adopt thoſe words of Luther, that Juſtification by faith alone is *Articulus ſtantis vel cadentis eccleſiæ*; though, alas! no longer ſince than when he wrote his laſt Journal, and *travelled alone in the Norwich coach*, he thought it high time to reject this doctrine, as *Ampullas et ſeſquipedalia verba*. Review, p. 127.

[X.]

I find I have a watchful competitor to deal with. I am accuſed of leaving out the middle clauſe of thoſe words, *according to our works, (becauſe of our works)* and *as our works deſerve*; yet had my learned friend looked but ſix lines farther, to the place where I draw my argument from the quotation, he would have ſeen them all three together; and therefore his charge againſt me on this head appears unfair beyond expreſſion; eſperially as it was ſo very immaterial whether it was inſerted or not in the former clauſe, that I abſolutely did not know it was omitted till the *Third Check* reminded me of it: However, the Vindicator has too much ſagacity not to be ſenſible how grievouſly he himſelf has tranſgreſſed, by real falſe quotations; and therefore had a mind to beſpatter me with a little of his own dirt: for, even in the *Third Check*, p. 66, as well as in *the Second*, he has again told us, that Mr. Weſley ſays in the Minutes, "*Not by the merit of works*," but by "*Believing in Chriſt*;" whereas the words in the Minutes are, "*Not by the merit of works, but by works as a condition.*" You will perhaps ſay, that your quotation may be gathered out of different parts of the Minutes: Abſolutely I think it cannot; but ſuppoſing it could, let me in like manner pick and chooſe my words, here one and there one, and I will engage to gather even three lines of goſpel divinity out of Mr. Weſley's ſermon on *the Great Aſſize*; though this, I am ſure, would be a very bold attempt.

XI. After

[XI.]

After your endeavours in your *Second Check* to enliſt Archbiſhop Leighton, John Bunyan, Mr. Whitefield, the Puritan divines, and Proteſtant Churches, under Mr. Weſley's banner, I am the leſs ſurprized that, in your *Third Check*, you ſhould bring up Mr. Madan as a *merit-monger*. And why this? Oh, becauſe he ſings that hymn in the Lock-Chapel,

" Thou haſt the Righteouſneſs ſupplied
" By which *we merit* Heaven."

As Mr. Madan thought the conduct of his dear friend Mr. F——r upon this occaſion rather unkind; he ſaid he would write to him on the ſubject: I ſhall therefore only obſerve, that both Mr. Madan and thoſe who join in this hymn always ſuppoſed that the ſenſe conveyed by it, is, " That Chriſt has ſupplied " a Righteouſneſs, (even his own perſonal Righteouſ- " neſs) which being imputed to the ſinner by faith, " *merits* everlaſting life." But I am ſure that Mr. Madan never thought the words quoted, could have been ſo far tortured as to countenance the conceit of *meriting* by man's own inherent righteouſneſs; and I dare ſay, till you put this conſtruction upon them, even Mr. Weſley never dreamed of any thing of the ſort, but compoſed the hymns on one of thoſe days in which he maintains the doctrine of imputed righteouſneſs; and I think Mr. Hervey quotes the very lines in queſtion to prove this point.

[XII.]

I cannot ſee why you ſhould ſay, *I make a bad matter worſe*, by ſpeaking as thouſands of good men have done before me, of the *ſecret* and *revealed* will of God. But do I hereby ſuppoſe that God has two

contrary

contrary wills? No, I believe that he wills nothing but his own glory, and that he will certainly make the moſt ſeemingly-contrary purpoſes work together for this great end. But, dear Sir, permit me to ſay, that you cavil about words; ſince you yourſelf, when preſſed by argument, muſt believe the ſame thing. For example: You believe it to be the *revealed* will of God, that man ſhould not ſhed innocent blood; yet would you deny, that even the immaculate Jeſus was *delivered to be crucified and ſlain by the determinate counſel and foreknowledge of God*; and that when *Herod and Pontius Pilate, and all the nation of the Jews, were gathered together againſt the holy child Jeſus, it was to do whatſoever God's hand and God's counſel determined before to be done?* If you deny this, you have the written word, flat and plain againſt you. Acts iv. 25, 26, 27, 28.—ii. 23. The ſame may be ſaid of Joſeph and his brethren. You believe it to be God's *revealed* will that every man ſhould love his brother as himſelf; yet it was certainly according to the *ſecret* purpoſe and will of God that Joſeph's brethren ſhould ſtrip him and ſell him to the Iſhmaelites, and that he ſhould be carried into Egypt, otherwiſe Joſeph muſt have told his brethren a groſs untruth when he ſaid, "Be not grieved nor angry with yourſelves that "ye ſold me hither: For GOD DID SEND ME "before you to preſerve life." This he repeats (v. 7), and in the next verſe again adds, "So now it "was not you that ſent me hither, BUT GOD."

[XIII.]

Dear Sir, why do you ſtill ſhelter a ſarcaſtic ſeverity under the mantle of *Suiſſe bluntneſs*, or the *plainneſs of a Mountaineer*; and why do you ſneeringly talk of *the difference between Engliſh and Suiſſe reaſon* [B]? I

[B] Page 65, l. 4.

hate

hate national reflections, and therefore would be far from making any; however, as you conſtantly plead your extraction as a reaſon for indulging a very improper ſpirit, I will tell you nearly what a ſincere well-wiſher of yours ſaid to me upon the occaſion: "I confeſs (ſaid he) that Mr. F——r does himſelf "no great ſervice by talking ſo much of his being "a Suiſſe; does he not recollect that it is the cha-"racter of a Suiſſe to fight under any maſter." To which let me add, that though by your *firſt birth* you have a right to aſſume the character of a *Suiſſe Mountaineer*, yet, by your *ſecond birth*, your abode ſhould be always *in the valley of humiliation*.

As to Mr. Weſley's treatment of all the eminent labourers of Chriſt who do not hold his ſentiments, of what ſort it has been I think I have made appear in my Review of his Doctrines, from the extracts collected out of the *Sacred Poems*, and the *Hymns on God's everlaſting Love, &c. &c.* and if your partiality for that gentleman will permit you to approve of his calling all the pious Calviniſt miniſters by the genteel names of the *Devil's factors*; *Satan's ſynagogue*; *children of the old roaring helliſh murderer, who believe his lie*; *advocates for ſin*; *witneſſes for the father of lies*; *blaſphemers*; *Satan-ſent preachers*, &c. &c. &c. I ſay, if theſe and many other names of the like import, can be approved by you, merely becauſe Mr. Weſley adopts them, I muſt inſtantly drop my pen, and bid adieu to all hopes of diveſting my dear Friend of that unhappy prejudice which poſſeſſes his mind.

[XIV.]

Whether you have anſwered or evaded the arguments in my Five Letters, muſt be left to the deciſion of thoſe who have, with a ſpirit of prayer and candour, read both our books. From the bottom of

of my ſoul, I give you the preference, both as to learning and natural abilities, and living and dying would ever bear this teſtimony of you, that you have *a ſingle eye* to promote the glory of God. Nor will I ever ſcruple to call you *a man after God's own heart*, notwithſtanding, in the matter of Mr. Weſley's Minutes, you have given a ſtrong ſpecimen of what ſtill remains in *your own heart*.

You have alſo a ſingular advantage over me in another reſpect, *viz.* in ſtanding up for the doctrine of works in oppoſition to free-grace; upon which account there is that in every man's heart, yea, even in the regenerate, which will ſide with your plan. But whether Mr. Weſley's doctrine or that of the Calviniſts has the moſt direct tendency to real practical Antinomianiſm, will be ſeen by thoſe who have read my late Review of his Doctrines: And I now venture to make a ſolemn appeal to the experience of all the children of God who have peruſed my firſt Five Letters, particularly the ſecond edition of them, whether they did not feel their hearts more humbled; their faith, hope, and love more enlivened, their hatred of ſin more ſtrengthened; and their deſires after holineſs a thouſand times more ardent; than they have done by reading your Vindication and the Two Checks; which, if I could believe them true, would ſink me into deſpair, and clip the wings of all goſpel obedience. Do not, therefore, my dear Sir, unkindly repreſent us any longer as *pleaders for ſin:* Indeed, indeed, we are not; and (with tears in my eyes I now write it) if God would give me my wiſh on this ſide Heaven, I would not heſitate a moment to ſay, *O let Chriſt be daily more and more precious to me, and ſin more and more odious; and let me live wholly and entirely to thy glory!*

Upon this ground I am ſure we both *meet*; and therefore, ſincerely entreating you to let me have a part in your prayers, that I may alſo *meet* you when you

you ſhall ſtand before the throne, with the hundred and forty-four thouſand which were redeemed from among men, I take my leave of the Controverſy; and beg to conclude myſelf,

Reverend and Dear Sir,

Your Affectionate Friend,

In the Beſt of Bonds,

The Author of P. Q.

BRITISH MUSEUM

FINIS.